## **CLAIMS**

What is claimed is:

| 1           | 1. A communications back-channel, for coordinating routing decisions, the  |
|-------------|--|
| 2           | communications back channel comprising:  |
| 3           | a plurality of networking devices;   |
| 4           | a plurality of routing intelligence units, wherein each of the plurality of the  |
| 5           | plurality of routing intelligence units includes software for controlling a distinct subset of                             |
| ### 6       | the plurality of networking devices, each of the plurality of routing intelligence units                                   |
| 7           | further including:   |
| 7<br>8<br>9 | one or more processes for controlling the distinct subset of networking devices; and                                       |
|             | one or more coordination processes for exchanging routing parameters with  |
| ## 1<br>    | the plurality of routing intelligence units.   |
| 1           | 2. The communications back-channel of claim 1, wherein the one or more processes   |
| 2           | for controlling the distinct subset of networking devices are Border Gateway Protocol                                      |
| 3           | (BGP) sessions.  |
| 1 2         | 3. The communications back-channel of claim 2, wherein each of the routing intelligence units is a route-reflector client. |
| 1           | 4. The communications back-channel of claim 3, wherein each of the distinct subset   |

2

of networking devices is a route reflector to the route reflector client.

| 1             | 5. The communications back-channel of claim 1, wherein the one or more                     |
|---------------|--|
| 2             | coordination process in each of the routing intelligence units includes BGP sessions.      |
| 1             | 6. The communications back-channel of claim 5, wherein the BGP sessions in the one         |
| 2             | or more coordination processes of each of the routing intelligence units includes:         |
| 3             | at least one BGP process; and  |
| 4             | at least one BGP stack, such that the at least one BGP stack exchanges                     |
| 5             | routing parameters between the routing intelligence unit and the at least one BGP process, |
| 6             | and the at least one BGP process exchanges routing parameters with the plurality of        |
| 7             | routing intelligence units.  |
| 13<br>13<br>1 | 7. The communications back-channel of claim 6, wherein the at least one BGP stack          |
| 142           | is a route reflector client, and the at least one BGP process is a route reflector.        |
| # 1<br># 1    | 8. The communications back-channel of claim 6, wherein the routing parameters              |
| 1             | include local path performance characteristics.  |
| initial a     |  |

- 9. The communications back-channel of claim 6, wherein the routing parameters include performance scores for routes.
- 1 10. The communications back-channel of claim 9, wherein the performance scores are
- 2 exchanged via a Local Preference field.

2

11. The communications back-channel of claim 1, further comprising:

- a plurality of communication links directly coupling the plurality of routing
- 3 intelligence units, wherein the plurality of communication links are dedicated exclusively
- 4 for exchanging routing parameters between the plurality of routing intelligence units.
- 1 12. The communications back-channel of claim 11, wherein the plurality of
- 2 communication links are at least partially comprised of physical links between the
- 3 plurality of routing intelligence units.

1

(...) 1

- 13. The communications back-channel of claim 11, wherein the plurality of communication links are at least partially comprised of logical links between the plurality of routing intelligence units.
- 14. A method of exchanging routing parameters amongst a plurality of decision makers, each decision maker controlling a distinct subset of a plurality of routers, wherein the plurality of decision makers are in communication via a dedicated mesh, the method comprising:
- 5 asserting a first plurality of preferred routes for a first plurality of prefixes to 6 the subset of routers; and
- 7 concurrent with the asserting the first plurality of preferred routes, sending a
- 8 plurality of local performance scores for the first plurality of routes to the plurality of
- 9 decision makers via the dedicated mesh.

| 1 | 15. The method of claim 14, further comprising:  |
|---|--|
| 2 | receiving a second plurality of routes for a second plurality of prefixes via the      |
| 3 | dedicated mesh.  |
| 1 | 16. The method of claim 15, further comprising:  |
| 2 | receiving a plurality of performance scores for the second plurality of routes.        |
| 1 | 17. The method of claim 16, wherein the plurality of performance scores are included   |
| 2 | in one or more Local Preferences fields in a BGP feed.                                 |
| 1 | 18. The method of claim 16, further comprising:  |
| 2 | applying penalties to each of the plurality of performance scores.                     |
| 1 | 19. The method of claim 14, wherein the asserting the first plurality of preferred     |
| 2 | routes is performed via a BGP feed to the subset of routers.                           |
| 1 | 20. The method of claim 14, wherein the plurality of local performance scores are sent |
| 2 | via a BGP feed to the dedicated mesh.  |
| 1 | 21. The method of claim 14, wherein the dedicated mesh is at least partially           |
| 2 | comprised of physical links between the plurality of decision makers.                  |
| 1 | 22. The method of claim 14, wherein the dedicated mesh is at least partially           |

The state of the s

2

comprised of logical links between the plurality of decision makers.